BEFORE THE DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY BOARD OF MEDICAL QUALITY ASSURANCE DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation Against:))	NO.	D-3002
IRVING ORLIN, M.D. Certificate No. G-22065,) } \		
Respondent.))		

DECISION

The attached Stipulation is hereby adopted by the Division of Medical Quality of the Board of Medical Quality Assurance as its Decision in the above-entitled matter.

This Decision shall become effective on December 23, 1983.

IT IS SO ORDERED November 23, 1983.

DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY BOARD OF MEDICAL QUALITY ASSURANCE

Idea

MILLER MEDEARIS Secretary-Treasurer

JOHN K. VAN DE KAMP, Attorney General 1 of the State of California NANCY K. CHIU, 2 Deputy Attorney General 3580 Wilshire Boulevard 3 | Los Angeles, California 90010 Telephone: (213) 736-2000 4 Attorneys for Complainant 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

Against:

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Respondent.

In the Matter of the Accusation

279 North Euclid Avenue Pasadena, California 91101 Physician's & Surgeon's

Certificate No. G22065

IRVING ORLIN

BEFORE THE DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY BOARD OF MEDICAL QUALITY ASSURANCE DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

> D-3002NO.

STIPULATION, DECISION AND ORDER

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by and between Mark Levin, Esquire, as attorney for respondent Irving Orlin, M.D., and Nancy K. Chiu, deputy attorney general, as attorney for complainant Stephen R. Wilford, that the following facts are true:

1. Complainant Stephen R. Wilford is the acting executive director and successor in interest to Robert G. Rowland, former executive director, of the Board of Medical Quality Assurance of the State of California (hereinafter "board"), and each acted in this matter in case number D-3002 in his official capacity only.

27

1.

- 2. On or about March 14, 1972, the board issued physician's and surgeon's certificate number G22065 to respondent Irving Orlin, M.D., (hereinafter "respondent") to practice medicine in the State of California. At all times relevant herein, said certificate has been and now is in full force and effect.
- 3. On or about January 7, 1983, an accusation in case number D-3002 was filed against respondent, a copy of which is attached as exhibit A. Said accusation was duly served on respondent. Respondent then filed a timely notice of defense.
- 4. Respondent has retained Mark Levin, Esq., as his attorney in this case and has counseled with said attorney concerning the effects of this stipulation.
- 5. Respondent understands the nature of the charges alleged in said accusation as constituting causes for imposing discipline upon respondent. Respondent is fully aware of his right to a hearing on the charges and allegations contained in said accusation, his right to a reconsideration, appeal and any and all other rights which may be accorded him pursuant to the California Administrative Procedure Act and that he hereby freely and voluntarily waives his right to a hearing, reconsideration, appeal and any and all other rights which may be accorded him by the California Administrative Procedure Act with regard to said accusation.
- 6. Respondent admits the truth of the factual allegations in the accusation, as follows:

/

1.0

A. In September and October 1981, respondent prescribed Preludin and Quaalude to various individuals outside the usual course of professional practice and not for a legitimate medical purpose, as follows:

	Date on Rx	Drug	"Patient"
(1)	9/24/81	Preludin	J Q
(2)	9/25/81	n	J Q
(3)	9/29/81	II.	P R
(4)	9/29/81	II	J E
(5)	10/9/81	и	D S
(6)	10/9/81	II	D P
(7)	10/16/81	Quaalude	S D
(8)	10/22/81	Preludin	S J
(9)	10/22/81	n	M K
(10)	10/22/81	11	K B
(11)	10/22/81	II	J M
(12)	10/22/81	25	N S

B. As a result of respondent's prescribing practice above, respondent was indicted on eleven counts of violating 21 U.S.C section 841(a)(1) (distribution of controlled substance). On or about September 8, 1982, respondent pled guilty to and was convicted of violating two counts of 21 U.S.C. section 841(a)(1), in the United States District Court for the Central District of California in the case entitled "United States of America v. Irving Orlin," case number CR 82-245.

(1) Imprisonment for one year on one count;

- (2) Imprisonment for five years on the second count, however, execution of this sentence was stayed and respondent was placed on probation for five years on general terms and conditions of probation and ordered to perform not less than 150 hours of community service for each year of probation; and
 - (3) Special parole of 10 years.
- 7. Based on the foregoing admissions of fact, respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to section 2234 of the Business and Professions Code in having been guilty of unprofessional conduct within the meaning of sections 2234, subdivision (e), 2236, subdivision (a), 2237, subdivision (a), 2238, 2242, subdivision (a) and 725 of the Business and Professions Code.
- 8. The admissions, stipulations, and agreements made herein are for the sole and exclusive purpose of resolving the above captioned matter.

WHEREFORE, it is stipulated and agreed that the Division of Medical Quality of the board (hereinafter "division") may impose the following discipline on respondent:

Physician's and surgeon's certificate number G22065 heretofore issued to respondent Irving Orlin, M.D., is hereby

 revoked; however, said revocation is stayed and respondent is placed on probation for seven (7) years upon the following terms and conditions:

1. Actual Suspension.

As part of probation, respondent is suspended from the practice of medicine for 120 days beginning on the effective date of this decision.

2. Psychiatric Evaluation.

Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, and on a periodic basis thereafter as may be required by the Division or its designee, respondent shall undergo a psychiatric evaluation by a Division-appointed psychiatrist who shall furnish a psychiatric report to the Division or its designee.

If respondent is required by the Division or its designee to undergo psychiatric treatment, respondent shall within 30 days of the notice of said requirement, submit to the Division for its prior approval the name and qualifications of a psychiatrist of respondent's choice. Upon approval of the treating psychiatrist, respondent shall undergo and continue psychiatric treatment until further notice from the Division. Respondent shall have the treating psychiatrist submit quarterly status reports to the Division.

Respondent shall not engage in the practice of medicine until notified by the Division of its determination that respondent is mentally fit to practice safely.

3. Oral Clinical Examination.

Within 60 days of the effective date of this decision, respondent shall take and pass an oral clinical examination in

prescribing drugs used in general medical practice to be administered by the Division or its designee. Said examination shall not be an examination in general medicine and may include prescribing drugs used in urology. If respondent fails this examination, respondent must wait three months between re-examinations, except that after three failures respondent must wait one year to take each necessary re-examination thereafter. The Division shall pay the cost of the first examination and respondent shall pay the costs of any subsequent examinations.

Respondent shall not practice medicine until respondent has passed this examination and has been so notified by the Division in writing.

4. <u>Controlled Drugs - Partial Restriction</u>.

Respondent shall not prescribe, administer, dispense, order, or possess any controlled substances as defined by the California Uniform Controlled Substances Act, except for those drugs listed in Schedules III, IV and V of the Act.

Respondent shall immediately surrender respondent's current DEA permit to the Drug Enforcement Administration for cancellation and reapply for a new DEA permit limited to those Schedules authorized by this order.

Orders forbidding respondent from personal use or possession of controlled substances or dangerous drugs do not apply to medications lawfully prescribed to respondent for a bona fide illness or condition by another practitioner.

/

5. Education Course.

Within 90 days of the effective date of this decision, and on an annual basis thereafter, respondent shall submit to the Division for its prior approval an educational program or courses related to pharmacology and medical therapeutics with emphasis on controlled substances, which shall not be less than 40 hours per year. The 40 hours shall be in addition to the Continuing Medical Education requirements for re-licensure. Following the completion of each course, the Division or its designee may administer an examination to test respondent's knowledge of the course.

6. Quarterly Reports.

Respondent shall submit quarterly declarations under penalty of perjury on forms provided by the Division, stating whether there has been compliance with all the conditions of probation.

7. Surveillance Program.

Respondent shall comply with the Division's probation surveillance program.

8. Interview with Medical Consultant.

Respondent shall appear in person for interviews with the Division's medical consultant upon request at various intervals and with reasonable notice.

9. Obey All Laws.

Respondent shall obey all federal, state and local laws, and all rules governing the practice of medicine in California.

7.

. .

. .

~0

 DATED: 9-19-83

DATED: 9-19-83.

10. Tolling for Out-of-State Practice or Residence.

In the event respondent should leave California to reside or to practice outside the state, respondent must notify the Division in writing of the dates of departure and return. Periods of residency or practice outside California will not apply to the reduction of this probationary period.

11. Completion of Probation.

Upon successful completion of probation, respondent's certificate will be fully restored.

12. Violation of Probation.

If respondent violates probation in any respect, the Division, after giving respondent notice and the opportunity to be heard, may revoke probation and carry out the disciplinary order that was stayed. If an accusation or petition to revoke probation is filed against respondent during probation, the Division shall have continuing jurisdiction until the matter is final, and the period of probation shall be extended until the matter is final.

JOHN K. VAN DE KAMP, Attorney General NANCY K. CHIU,

Deputy Attorney General

By Mancy & Ohin

NANCY K. CHIU

Deputy Attorney General

Attorneys for Complainant

MARK LEVIN, ESQ.

Attorney for Respondent

1	I have read and discussed the above stipulation with my				
2	counsel Mark Levin. I fully understand the terms of the				
3	above stipulation and hereby freely consent to and accept said				
4	stipulation including the waiver of any right to a hearing and the				
5	admissions made herein. I understand that if the Division of				
6	Medical Quality disapproves of or non adopts this stipulation as				
7	its decision, this stipulation shall be null and void.				
8	DATED: Sept-19, 19.83				
9	IRVING ORLIN, M.D. Respondent				
10					
11					
12	The above stipulation is adopted as the decision of the				
13	Division of Medical Quality of the Board of Medical Quality				
14	Assurance.				
15	This decision shall be effective on theday of				
16	,1983.				
17	IT IS SO ORDERED thisday of,				
18	1983.				
19					
20					
21	Division of Medical Quality Board of Medical Quality Assurance				
22	and the state of t				
23					
24	S2 ORLIN1-9				
25	03573110- LA82AD1478				
26					

GEORGE DEUKMEJIAN, Attorney General 1 NANCY K. CHIU, Deputy Attorney General 2 3580 Wilshire Boulevard Los Angeles, California 90010 Telephone: (213) 736-2000 4 Attorneys for Complainant 5 6 7 BEFORE THE 8 DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY BOARD OF MEDICAL QUALITY ASSURANCE 9 DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS 10 STATE OF CALIFORNIA In the Matter of the Accusation 11 NO. D-3002 Against: ACCUSATION 12 IRVING ORLIN 279 North Euclid Avenue 13 Pasadena, California 91101 Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate 14 No. G22065 15 Respondent. 16 COMES NOW, Robert G. Rowland complainant herein, 17 who alleges as follows: 18 1. Complainant Robert G. Rowland is the executive 19 director of the Board of Medical Quality Assurance of the State of California (hereinafter "board") and makes and 21 files this accusation in his official capacity only. 22 2. On or about March 14, 1972, the board issued 23 24 physician's and surgeon's certificate number G22065 to respondent Irving Orlin, M.D. (hereinafter "respondent") to 25 practice medicine in the State of California. At all times 26

relevant herein, said certificate has been and now is in

full force and effect.

- 3. Section 2004 of the Business and Professions Code (hereinafter the "code") provides, in part, that the Division of Medical Quality of the board (hereinafter "division") shall have responsibilty for the administration and hearing of disciplinary actions; and carrying out of disciplinary actions appropriate to findings made by itself, a medical quality review committee or a hearing officer.
- 4. Section 2234 of the code provides that the division shall take action against any holder of a certificate who is guilty of unprofessional conduct. Subdivision (e), of said section provides that unprofessional conduct includes the commission of any act involving dishonesty or corruption which is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a physician and surgeon.
- 5. Section 2236, subdivision (a), of the code provides, in part, that the conviction of any offense substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a physician and surgeon constitutes unprofessional conduct.
- 6. Section 2237, subdivision (a), of the code provides, in part, that the conviction of a charge of violating any federal statutes or regulations or any statute or regulation of this state, regulating narcotics, dangerous drugs, or controlled substances, constitutes unprofessional conduct.
- 7. Section 2238 of the code provides that a violation of any federal statute or federal regulation or any of the statutes or regulations of this state regulating narcotics, dangerous

.

drugs, or controlled substances, constitutes unprofessional conduct.

- 8. Section 2242, subdivision (a), of the code provides that prescribing, dispensing, or furnishing dangerous drugs as defined in section 4211 of the code without a good faith prior examination and medical indication therefor, constitutes unprofessional conduct.
- 9. Section 725 of the code provides, in part, that repeated acts of clearly excessive prescribing or administering of drugs or treatment as determined by the standard of local community of licensees is unprofessional conduct for a physician and surgeon.
- 10. Preludin is a trade name for phenmetrazine hydrochloride, which is classified as a federal schedule II controlled substance and a dangerous drug within the meaning of section 4211, subdivision (a), of the code.
- ll. Quaalude is a brand name for methaqualone, which is classified as a federal schedule II controlled substance and a dangerous drug within the meaning of section 4211, subdivision (a), of the code.
- 12. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to section 2234 of the code in that respondent has been guilty of unprofessional conduct within the meaning of sections 2236 and 2237 of the code in having been convicted of violating drug statutes, and the conviction of the offense is

substantially related to the qualifications, functions or duties of a physician and surgeon. The circumstances are as follows:

A. In September and October 1981, respondent prescribed Preludin and Quaalude to various individuals outside the usual course of professional practice and not for a legitimate medical purpose, as follows:

	Date on Rx	Drug	" <u>Patient</u> "
(1)	9/24/81	Preludin	J Q
(2)	9/25/81	и	J Q
(3)	9/29/81	11	P R
(4)	9/29/81	u .	J E
(5)	10/9/81	ti .	D S
(6)	10/9/81	п	D P
(7)	10/16/81	Quaalude	S D
(8)	10/22/81	Preludin	s J
(9)	10/22/81	п	M K
(10)	10/22/81	11	K B
(11)	10/22/81	и	J M
(12)	10/22/81	Quaalude	N S

B. As a result of respondent's prescribing practice above, respodent was indicted on eleven counts of violating 21 U.S.C. section 841(a)(1) (disturbution of controlled substance). On or about September 8, 1981, respondent pled guilty to and was convicted of violating two counts of 21 U.S.C. section 841(a)(1), in the United States

District Court for the Central District of

California in the case entitled "United States of

America v. Irving Orlin," case number CR 82-245. As

a result of said conviction, respondent's sentence
included the following:

- (1) imprisonment for one year on one count;
- (2) imprisonment for five years on the second count, however, execution of this sentence was stayed and respondent was placed on probation for five years on general terms and conditions of probation and ordered to perform not less than 150 hours of community service each year of probation; and
- (3) special parole of 10 years consecutive to the above five year probation sentence.
- 13. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to section 2234 of the code in that respondent engaged in unprofessional conduct within the meaning of section 2238 of the code in having violated a federal statute regulating dangerous drugs or controlled substances, as more particularly alleged hereinabove at subparagraphs 12A and 12B, which are incorporated herein by reference as though fully set forth hereat.
- 14. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to section 2234 of the code in that respondent has engaged in unprofessional conduct within the meaning of section 2242 of the code in having prescribed dangerous drugs

without a good faith prior examination and medical indication therefor. The circumstances are as follows:

- A. The matters alleged hereinabove at subparagraphs 12A and 12B are incorporated herein by reference as though fully set forth hereat.
- B. Respondent prescribed the above dangerous drugs without conducting a good faith prior examination of the person for whom the drug was prescribed and without medical indication therefor.
- C. Respondent issued prescriptions for dangerous drugs for Descriptions of Secondary, Descriptions of Secondary and New Secondary without viewing any of their medical records or without even seeing each of them to conduct any examination and to determine any medical indication for the prescriptions.
- pursuant to section 2234 of the code in that respondent has engaged in unprofessional conduct within the meaning of section 725 of the code in having engaged in repeated acts of clearly excessive prescribing of drugs, as more particularly alleged hereinabove at subparagraphs 12A, 12B, 14B and 14C, which are incorporated herein by reference as though fully set forth hereat.

WHEREFORE, complainant prays that the division hold a hearing on the matters alleged herein and following said hearing issue a decision:

- Suspending or revoking respondent's physician's and surgeon's certificate; and
- 2. Taking such other and further action as the division deems appropriate.

DATED: January 7, 1983

ROBERT G. ROWLAND Executive Director

Board of Medical Quality Assurance

State of California

Complainant